



Archived at the Flinders Academic Commons:
<http://hdl.handle.net/2328/27231>

This is a scan of a document number DUN/Speeches/3600
in the Dunstan Collection, Special Collections, Flinders University Library.
<http://www.flinders.edu.au/library/info/collections/special/dunstan/>

Title:

Television broadcast NWS9 February 10, 1969 - Debate between Premier Steele Hall
and Don Dunstan on the Chowilla Dam

Please acknowledge the source as:
Dunstan Collection, Flinders University Library.
Identifier: DUN/Speeches/3600

© Copyright Estate Donald Allan Dunstan

Tonight for the first time in South Australia, and as far as we know for the first time in the history of Australian television, a Leader of a Government and a Leader of an Opposition have agreed to debate together on a matter of outstanding importance to the matter of this State and, indeed, for the people of Australia as a whole. But before Mr. Steele Hall and Mr. Dunstan come into the studio, we are to have 15 minutes or so discussing the background to the decision of the River Murray Commission to recommend that work on the Chowilla Dam should not be resumed at this stage and instead planning should proceed immediately for a new water storage on the Murray River system at Dartmouth on the Mitta Mitta River in Victoria. To take part in this discussion we have with us Mr. H.L. Beaney, the Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department of South Australia and South Australia's Commissioner on the River Murray Commission; and on my right Mr. A.M. Kinnear, the E. & W.S.'s Assistant Engineer for Irrigation and Drainage and South Australia's representative on the Technical Committee of the River Murray Commission.

The Technical Committee is the body which reported to the Commission last January on the advantages of the Dartmouth Dam in preference to going ahead with the Chowilla scheme at this stage. By its recent decision the River Murray Commission has reversed its stand, which it took in 1961, which recommended that the provision of a large water storage at Chowilla would be the most effective and economical means of regulating the waters of the River Murray to give greater security, particularly in times of drought, to the people of Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia. These three States, together with the Commonwealth, make up the membership on the Commission and each Government appoints a part-time Commissioner to this particular Commission, but under the River Murray Agreement, which controls the work of the Commission, all major decisions by the Commission must be unanimous and failing such agreement the matter must be referred to an independent arbitrator.

Tonight, neither the Premier nor the Leader of the Opposition will themselves direct questions to the two South Australian representatives with me, who have been so closely involved in the decision to recommend that Chowilla should be shelved at least for the time being, and in its place work should begin as soon as possible on a new dam at Dartmouth. Instead I have been given a series of questions prepared by Mr. Steele Hall and Mr. Dunstan and at my own discretion and if time allows I have been asked by these two gentlemen to put these questions to either Mr. Beaney or to Mr. Kinnear. I do not propose to announce from whom the questions have come and without further ado I would now like to direct my first question, which is quite a general one, to both Mr. Beaney and to Mr. Kinnear.

Gentlemen, as I understand it, the River Murray Commission in deciding back in 1961 to recommend Chowilla in preference to any other new major storage on the Murray River system had the advantage of what the present Minister for National Development, Mr. Fairbairn, then described and I quote from Hansard 'had the advantage of a comprehensive and a complex investigation'. Why then gentlemen has Dartmouth now been recommended by the River Murray Commission in preference to Chowilla after this particular examination and study, which seems to have been so detailed? Perhaps Mr. Beaney you could lead off for us.

(Mr. Beaney) The original concept of Chowilla came from South Australia. It was proposed by South Australia to the Commission and was very thoroughly investigated by the Commission on certain assumptions that were made back in the beginning of this decade, and it was very definitely shown that not only South Australia but the two upper States of New South Wales and Victoria could win considerable advantages from the operation of this storage. Tenders were called and the price escalated to a rather high level which made the upper States query the advantages that might be had from this storage and the cost of water to themselves. We had also experienced some rather poor River conditions with poor quality water as we had last summer and this highlighted certain operational procedures which had been introduced in the earliest days which were no longer tenable, and the Commission instructed that further studies be made. These would show that the overall benefit of a storage at Dartmouth will benefit the system by something like 860,000 acre ft. more water than could be taken out of the Chowilla system, and each State is in a position to share in this water.

Alright. Now you weren't on the Technical Committee, of course, which made this report last year with respect to the feasibility of the Dartmouth scheme and made some comparisons with the Chowilla scheme. I understand, Mr. Kinnear, you were the South Australian representative on the Technical Committee which did this detailed study which resulted in reversing the previous decision. Now have you anything to add to what Mr. Beaney just told us about the change in front of the Commission on this issue?

(Mr. Kinnear) Well, Professor Castles, the end result of the studies support Mr. Beaney's statement that with Chowilla Dam South Australia could receive 1.254 million acre ft. a year and there would not be sufficient additional yield to satisfy the requirements of the two eastern States.

(Prof. Castles) So, in other words, as a result of your particular report last year the two states of New South Wales and Victoria will, in fact, be getting an increased allotment.

Does this mean that South Australia will be getting the same allotment which it would have had otherwise if the Chowilla Scheme had have been continued with?

(Mr. Kinnear) There is potential for a greater allotment for South Australia with the Dartmouth Scheme and it will also more than satisfy the needs for the upper States as at present.

(Prof. Castles) Now you don't think Chowilla Scheme would have, in fact, done this for the upper States after examining all the technical problems that you have been involved in?

(Mr. Kinnear) No, I don't.

(Prof. Castles) Now, in these circumstances too, one of the problems which many people face I think in worrying about Chowilla, is the fact that back when the scheme was originally brought out and originally approved by the Parliaments of Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia and the Commonwealth Parliament, one thing which was important in the minds of most of us was that there was a need to maximise the storage of water for South Australia, particularly at a time of drought, and at the same time to ensure that in a period of drought South Australia would continue to get an adequate supply of water for its industrial, its agricultural and its development of domestic supplies. Now, in your view, having been on the Technical Committee and studied this problem in such detail, do you believe that South Australia will get any less water than it would have got if it had, in fact, followed through with the Chowilla Scheme?

(Mr. Kinnear) I believe it has a potential for getting more water.

(Prof. Castles) Only a potential, you wouldn't say it would get more water?

(Mr. Kinnear) I feel, as a Technical man, that it's quite sensible to say it can get more water.

(Prof. Castles) Mr. Beaney, I was coming back to you to see what you felt about this.

(Mr. Beaney) Yes. Any acceptance or any approval or any agreement that I have made in supporting Dartmouth is conditional on South Australia getting more water.

(Prof. Castles) In other words it's completely conditional that we must get more water out of Dartmouth than we would have got out of Chowilla?

(Mr. Beaney) This is the only reason for South Australia's support and we can get quite a large increase on our entitlement out of the Dartmouth Scheme. It is capable of giving it to us.

(Prof. Castles) Well, can I raise this question with you. One of the questions that has been given to me which runs along these lines. What guarantee have we then, Mr. Beaney, that if New South Wales and Victoria get extra water from Dartmouth. further uncontrolled development will not occur in these States again creating excess demand for water in Victoria and New South Wales and so adversely affecting the salinity problem in South Australia?

(Mr. Beaney) You raise a number of issues there.

(Prof. Castles) This isn't one of our questions. This is one we have been asked to put forward to you.

(Mr. Beaney) Just a couple of notes on this. The degree of development cannot be controlled by the River Murray Commission. The amount of water provided to the upper States and to the three States, in fact, is controlled by the Commission and the Commission is in a position to fairly distribute the water that has been allowed to the three States. In other words, South Australia's entitlement plus the proportion of the demand that the upper States can take while still providing South Australia's entitlement.

(Prof. Castles) So you think we still get our entitlement?

(Mr. Beaney) I'm quite sure we can.

(Prof. Castles) Now can I ask you another question here. I understand there has been an excess demand by New South Wales and Victoria that New South Wales and Victoria's requirements are stated to be 2.7 million acre ft. per year to satisfy their existing needs as against the present supply to them of 2.084 million acre ft. per year. Now are these figures reasonably accurate?

(Mr. Beaney) They sound about right.

(Prof. Castles) Yes. Now has this excess demand by Victoria and by New South Wales been produced by uncontrolled development of irrigation settlements in New South Wales and Victoria? I understand, and the viewers might not realise, that in fact the River Murray Commission doesn't control the tributaries of the Murray below Albury. Now I think this question is aimed at asking is the uncontrolled development of irrigation settlements below Albury causing an excess demand in Victoria and New South Wales which has adversely affected our position with respect to this water scheme?

(Mr. Beaney) It has not adversely affected our position. Under the original Chowilla proposal the upper States were promised approximately 2.8 million acre ft. per year and so really, they are living within the area of the promise that Chowilla was to confer on them or the benefits that Chowilla was to confer.

(Prof. Castles) And as you see it there will be no real variation in the water entitlements?

(Mr. Beaney) I can see no variation. I can't say that the upper States will limit their irrigation but they must limit with available water and the available water to them out of the Dartmouth Scheme will confirm something of the order of this 2.8, which Chowilla can no longer do, and they will be in a position to get the benefit while we can still take out 1½ million acre ft., which we are asking for.

(Prof. Castles) I see. And so with these circumstances you think that the situation will be much the same. Now can I raise another issue. Perhaps Mr. Kinnear was involved in the Technical debate on this, and as far as South Australia is concerned, we will be seemingly getting much the same sort of water supplies coming through with the Dartmouth Scheme, but this is in normal years. Now I noticed in the report that you were a party to that, in fact, there are problems with respect to drought years. Now, it seems to me, that periods of restriction are periods of real concern to South Australia. If I understand it rightly, in 1959, something like 80% of our water supplies were drawn from the Murray system during a period of shortage of water. Now, in this situation, is South Australia going to be able to, in a sense, have a maximum supply of water during drought periods in the same way that it would have had a maximum supply, so we thought, under the Chowilla Scheme? In other words, are we going to get the same amount of water in a period of drought with Dartmouth as we would have got with the Chowilla Scheme?

(Mr. Kinnear) The Technical Committee examined the situation with a Dartmouth under varying conditions of restrictions that each State could expect to find. We determined that with flows of the order of 1.5 million acre ft. per year it would seem that South Australia could remain unrestricted in all years. We ran a check study on this and this did, in fact, confirm that there is every indication technically that you could ask for 1.5 million acre ft., you could expect it to be supplied and the eastern States could also, even under those conditions, expect a satisfactory yield to them.

(Prof. Castles) So you don't think we will suffer greatly because of this?

(Mr. Kinnear) I don't.

(Prof. Castles) Well, gentlemen, I see our time has almost expired. Can I ask you one final question and can I ask it to each of you? Now I think that this is a question of real importance to all of us. Does the decision to recommend Dartmouth mean that

Chowilla will never be built? Mr. Beaney, firstly.

(Mr. Beaney) Certainly not. The decision to recommend Dartmouth with the support of South Australia on the assumption that we get an increased entitlement, is based on the conditions in the next decade. We all realise that this will not be the final development in the Murray. Further storages will be necessary and I think there is a very high likelihood that Chowilla would be the most favourable storage to follow Dartmouth.

(Prof. Castles) Would you agree with that Mr. Kinnear?

(Mr. Kinnear) I would.

(Prof. Castles) So you both believe, then, that Chowilla could well be built at some time in the future, after the Dartmouth scheme has been completed?

(Mr. Kinnear) I think this is accepted.

(Prof. Castles) Alright. Well thank you very much gentlemen. It's been a great pleasure to speak with you this evening and I'm sure that you have helped to illuminate a number of the problems which have been concerning the people of South Australia over this very interesting and very complicated Chowilla controversy.

(Mr. Hall) The choice of whether South Australia gets its guarantee of water in the future from Chowilla or Dartmouth rests upon the results of a Technical Committee, a Technical Committee of the River Murray Commission, a Commission which will control and build the dam, whether it is built at Chowilla or elsewhere in some other State, a Committee which was set up in 1967 with the approval of Mr. Dunstan, the then Premier of South Australia. That Committee has since reported and my Cabinet and I have questioned this Committee for many days and Mr. Beaney is well aware of the searching questions we put to him trying to find flaws in a report which we have found in the end to be correct. And, therefore, we have accepted this report as being the grounds for giving us the opportunity in South Australia to negotiate for a substantial increase in South Australia's water supply.

Now, Mr. Dunstan has not accepted the conclusions of the report that he approved in 1967. With what authority does he now attack the judgement of the South Australian River Murray Commissioner and say that he has accepted a slanted report? Both Sir Thomas Playford and Mr. Dunstan has said that they do not quarrel with the precise technical details of the Technical Committee, but they question the assumptions it has made.

What on earth do they mean when they question the assumptions, when they say it was wrong for the Committee to study the base flow at Mildura, to study the inclusion of the Menindie Lakes, to study a storage at Dartmouth on the Mitta River? Who agreed to these assumptions? Let me go back to the Commission's meeting in August 11th, 1967, when the South Australian Commissioner agreed that the Technical Committee should determine the pattern of future studies and refer these to the Commission for their concurrence before proceeding. These studies were to include further study of the Chowilla proposal, the value of the Dartmouth Dam, storage possibilities at Lake , the continued use of the Menindie Lakes, equal sharing by the three States and the possibility of South Australia being unrestricted at all times. What happened then? The Commissioner returned to South Australia and there was a Debate in the House and many questions. The then Premier, Mr. Dunstan, said we could have told the Commissioner to get the best results that he could for this State and that was his instruction. He was instructed to get the best he could within his discretion for this State. Now, it so happens that the Commissioner went back to a following meeting of the Commission after he had reported to Mr. Dunstan and after there had been a debate in the House. And what did he do after he had seen Mr. Dunstan? He joined in recommending, on the 10th of October, 1967, that the Commission should have a plan of studies. It was considered that there should be studies made up of combinations of the following: Menindie Lakes operated as a River Murray Commission storage or as a New South Wales storage; sharing restrictions; minimum supplies to South Australia; minimum supplies to upper States; minimum flow in the River Murray upstream and the Darling junction; and in the second part the use of the Euston storage; the use of selected capacities of Upper Murray or Mitta storages; Murray Gates, Dartmouth or Gibbo; determination of the capacity of Chowilla necessary to ensure that South Australia always received its full entitlement and the use of the Buffalo storage, the very things that Mr. Dunstan now questions and says it should not be assumed by the Commission.

Now, Sir, the basic problems of Chowilla are these. That, firstly, it allowed no flow in the River at Mildura and, secondly, there were only thirteen manual studies backing the benefits that were supposed to come from Chowilla, and since doubts were raised on costs and salinity, the Technical Committee has been set up with the approval of the then Government and has made 260 complete studies of the River Murray system and it has recognised, in addition, there must be a base flow in the River at Mildura, just as the River Murray Commission has always recommended that and provided for a base flow in the River through South Australia.

South Australia has done more to conserve and distribute its water resources per capita than any other State in Australia. My Government is planning decades ahead and, at this moment, is considering what is termed water harvesting by pumping from the Teale Flat Dam of the future to a huge pipeline, to a large storage yet to be constructed in the Adelaide Hills. And yet Mr. Dunstan attacked our handling of the River Murray system last Tuesday in the House in a speech which had eleven mis-statements and errors in fact. One of his supporting speakers, the Member for Edwardstown said who has got at the Government? One wonders there is not some bribery and corruption somewhere. Is this the sort of approach one should make, as responsible Members of Parliament, concerning one of the most vital issues that will ever face the South Australian public? What authority has Mr. Dunstan to say that my Government stop the Chowilla project, when he agreed to its deferrment in August 1967, and agreed then to the setting up of a Technical Committee which he so vigorously opposes in its findings now? Chowilla died as a first storage on the River Murray system when Mr. Dunstan hawked a letter, or a statement of intent, through to the other Premiers and the Commonwealth of Australia. When he reported this to the newspapers, it was printed in the "Advertiser" on the 15th of November, 1967. Let me read what his statement of intent to the other Premiers was. -- The present studies being carried out by the River Commission are for the purpose of exploring the maximum use that can be made of the waters of the River Murray. It has been indicated earlier that by the construction of the Chowilla Dam South Australia would gain considerable relief from periodic restriction of reply and the upstream States would also benefit. The decision to defer construction of the Chowilla Dam arose from factors not previously established. Current investigations are aimed at developing an economic plan to sustain the advantages mentioned. It was left to our party in Opposition to strengthen the claim for Chowilla and this led to our election platform when we re-stated our fight for Chowilla, and since then to the pamphlet "The 14 Facts on Chowilla" where we re-established our fight for a South Australian storage. What authority does he have to say that the Hume Dam rarely fills, when in fact it's filled 26 out of the 35 years of its existence, and between the years 1945 and 1964 it filled 18 years out of 20? And even though it has been increased in size by a quarter since 1961, it will fill more often than not in the future. Who on earth advised him to say there is no adequate information on the flow of the Mitta River when, in fact, the 60 years study made of the River system was based on adjusted calculated flows that had existed for the measurement of the Mitta since 1885? What special dispensation enables Mr.

-7-

Dunstan to ignore page 6 and page 8 of the Technical Committee's report where he says that no mention is made of South Australian yield or possible gain for this State where, in fact, it is quite clearly stated there that the Committee considered these matters? What peculiar logic gives him the right to say we already have an increased entitlement through the Chowilla Scheme when, in fact, the Agreement clearly states that in a year of restriction all States would then share on a third equal basis of that quota already established of 1¼ million acre ft? From the study I made of the Chowilla situation and the Dartmouth comparison and from the advice that I have received, I believe that this is the last chance that South Australia will have to increase its water entitlement. We will have a chance to build more dams but this is the last chance to increase the entitlement. Do we throw this away in some strange mass exercise of self denial or do we grasp the opportunity and increase our entitlement for future development? My answer is clear. I will fight for the future, regardless of the political consequences at this time.

(Prof. Castles) Thank you very much Mr. Premier. And now without any further ado we turn to the Leader of the Opposition and former State Premier, Mr. Don Dunstan, who will now reply to the Premier's remarks. Mr. Dunstan.

(Mr. Dunstan) Thank you Professor. Our water supply in South Australia is too important a subject for political bickering. We all ought to fight to ensure the water supply. This is the driest part of the driest continent in the world and we can't develop without water. New South Wales and Victoria depend on the Murray for water for irrigation only and for the Murray towns, but the Murray is our lifeline in South Australia providing not merely irrigation but water for industry from Whyalla to Adelaide and the basis of domestic and farm water for 85% of our people. Now the most important questions for us are not just how much water comes down the Murray to us in a normal year, but, firstly, since the flow fluctuates widely from year to year, how often dry years occur in which there will be insufficient water for our needs and how much water we can regularly count on taking out of the Murray, even in a dry year to keep trees and vines and irrigation areas alive and industry going, and, secondly, what quality of water will we get? The River Murray Commission, in which we take part, has no control over the tributaries of the Murray in New South Wales and Victoria west of Albury, and so if they go in for careless irrigation practices and put very salty water down the River to us as they have done, all we can do is protest and ~~hear~~ Sir Henry Bolte and Mr. Askin say: Well, we are very sorry. We'll try not to let it happen again.

Now, the Chowilla Dam was designed to cope with these two basic needs of South Australia. We have heard something about the first, we haven't heard much about the second tonight. By providing an enormous body of fresh water at the head of our section of the Murray it could impound water from all the major Rivers flowing into the Murray and fill at flood time. It would reduce from one year in ten to one year in fifty the years in which there would be less than our minimum normal flow in the River and in which we would have to reduce the water we take out of it. This, on the advice given to the Government by the previous Engineer-in-Chief, would increase effectively the amount we could safely take out of the Murray by up to 300,000 acre ft. per year because the water would be right there. What is more, the peaks of very salty water coming from up-river would be smoothed out by this large body of fresh water acting as a buffer between us and the other States, so that we could be assured of good water. Now we got the agreement to build Chowilla in exchange for our rights in waters which were diverted in the Snowy Scheme from the Murray to the Murrumbidgee. Victoria and New South Wales got the whole benefit from the Snowy Scheme. With Chowilla it was our turn to get a major work for our benefit. New South Wales and Victoria were to benefit also because they wouldn't have to provide us with water in a dry year. They would be able to use all the resources upstream of Chowilla themselves instead of giving us a share and we would get our water from Chowilla. The agreement ratified unanimously, as you have been told, by the four Parliaments concerned provided the Commission could spend \$32 million on Chowilla. When the design was finished the cost had risen to \$43 million. All parties agreed to that. And then when the tenders came in the lowest tender was \$68 million. Unfortunately, as Mr. Beaney has said, at the same time there had been a build-up of salt in the River to a degree previously unknown. The upstream States thought that they would have to keep sending water down to us in a dry year, even with Chowilla there, merely to wash the salt out and, therefore, they wouldn't get the benefits they thought they would. And they refused to let a contract to build Chowilla until they had the studies made to see whether the water could be provided more cheaply and what the real effect on Chowilla was of the salt in the River and how saltiness over the whole length of the River could be controlled. Now at that stage there were two alternatives for South Australia and only two. We would agree to the studies being made or we could go to arbitration as provided in the Agreement to try to force the arbitrator to direct the building of Chowilla. The difficulty about that was, of course, that the cost of Chowilla exceeded the amount shown in the agreement. If we went to arbitration at that stage, then the arbitrator would certainly have asked for the information from the studies

before he made up his mind. It would merely have taken us longer to enforce our rights. Our engineers advised us then, rightly as it turns out, that the studies would show that any other way of providing the water would be at least as costly, that saltiness would be reduced by Chowilla and that there was no other way of giving all the benefits to South Australia that Chowilla would provide. We knew we would be in a strong position to go to arbitration and enforce the agreement. At the time I was bitterly attacked by Mr. Hall for agreeing to the studies, studies that he now says he relies on. I asked him then, and since, if he believed we should have gone to arbitration at once, the only other course open. I have never had an answer.

Now we have the report of the Technical Committee. It disposes of the two major objections to Chowilla - cost and salinity. In fact, it shows that there will be quite a bit less salt at peak periods than without Chowilla. Nevertheless, the Government has drawn a conclusion from the report that it should support a dam at Dartmouth instead of Chowilla. The dam at Dartmouth would be a thousand river miles away from South Australia and the water would take six weeks or more to get here. The earliest possible completion date would be 1973 and it would take four years to fill, so you wouldn't get the full benefit for quite a few years. But the report has some strange features. The studies of the benefits of Dartmouth were designed to find, and this is expressed in the report, how extra water could be given to New South Wales and Victoria while maintaining the minimum flow of water to South Australia other than in an especially dry year. In other words, because New South Wales and Victoria have allowed vines and trees to be planted needing water, they now want the extra water for themselves without giving us the guarantee of the extra water and protection from restriction in dry years that Chowilla would have provided. Now this is the basis upon which they are breaking the solemn agreement made with us, and I ask Mr. Hall seeing the Chowilla agreement is being broken in favour of extra water for New South Wales and Victorian planters, broken because they were not to provide us with a flow in the River which they now base breaking the agreement on, what guarantee have we that any other agreement will be kept? Moreover, since our bargaining position to get anything out of the present situation depended on our right to go to arbitration and enforce our right to the building of Chowilla, why have you thrown that right away by having our representative vote to ditch Chowilla in favour of Dartmouth? I ask you too, as Minister for Industrial Development, how you can advocate giving away the injection of about \$60 millions into the South Australian economy and give it to Sir Henry Bolte instead? There had been talk about helping the private earth-moving industry in South Australia. Chowilla would

have been the largest single soil engineering project in the State's history, and in any overseas trip to attract industry here, what industry or group of industries could be got which would produce an investment of that size with the resulting deployment, housing, business, railway undertakings and engineering experiences. Could I ask you lastly, since this seems to have been the basis of your statements, on this particular matter recently leading to this debate, do you really say that opposition to the course that you are now following is merely party politics? We are not playing party politics. We are continuing the fight for Chowilla which Sir Thomas Playford began. Are you accusing Sir Thomas Playford of playing party politics when he disagrees with what you have done? I believe that he is honestly seeking what he believes to be right for South Australia and what has been shown necessarily to be the real benefit for South Australia in ensuring water storage, an assurance which was spoken of in Mr. Bonython's recent lecture after he, like Sir Thomas Playford, had consulted with Mr. Beaney. Speaking of the benefits which I have spoken of at Chowilla he said: Perhaps a dam at Dartmouth will do some of these things, it cannot do all of them.

(Mr. Hall) Professor, what Mr. Dunstan has done is to restate the problem and throw up a number of questions based on as many inaccuracies as his debate in the House.

(Prof. Castles) There was one question he asked at the beginning. He did say that Chowilla would reduce from one in ten to one in fifty years the period in which we will have to reduce our intake from the Murray River system. This seemed to me to be a key fact --

(Mr. Hall) This, of course, is not strictly correct although his intention is correct. Chowilla as now planned would guarantee our water supply in South Australia in all the years that have been studied in the 55 years of Chowilla research without restriction at $1\frac{1}{4}$ million acre ft., all of them. However, Dartmouth has the capacity, if I am able to negotiate $1\frac{1}{2}$ million acre ft. out of the other States and out of the Commonwealth to supply a guarantee to South Australia over all of those years that have been studied for $1\frac{1}{2}$ million acre ft. Now let me remind you that the divertible components of our allocation is not the whole, because 564,000 acre ft. of our $1\frac{1}{4}$ million is dilution water which is wasted because of evaporation or dilution down the River, and the increase that I am seeking on our divertible component is 35%. Now, does Mr. Dunstan say forget it, don't ask for it? And this, of course, is why this report dealt with it as he is now criticizing it. It said we assume for South

Australia 1½ million acre ft. Why? Because that is all he ever asked for, and if he goes through his statements of intent or other reference that he has made, whenever he has mentioned a figure he's said let's guarantee 1½ million acre ft. And that's why it's there. He never asked for any more.

(Mr. Dunstan) It is quite true that the Committee's report does assume 1.254 million acre ft. for South Australia, that's with Dartmouth. But it also takes very great care to say that our sharing ratio in years of restriction should be altered. Now if it's assuming, and if it's proved that there will never be years of restriction, why is it suggested that we ought to alter the sharing ratio in years of restriction to 5/15 instead of 3/30?

(Mr. Hall) The answer of course, Professor, is simple, because they have not taken us to get 1½ million acre ft. They have assumed 1½ and if I could negotiate the 1½, obviously the sharing will not be of importance.

(Mr. Dunstan) But the sharing relates to a year of restriction.

(Mr. Hall) Well if I get what I have laid down as a condition for Dartmouth, there will not be a restriction below 1½ million acre ft.

(Mr. Dunstan) Well that is what you are saying, But, in fact --

(Mr. Hall) What I am asking for too.

(Mr. Dunstan) Yes, but right at the moment what we have got in this report, and here are the three conditions set out here, is the conditions common to these studies are 1.254 million acre ft. South Australian, Menindie under the River Murray Commission and a sharing ratio of 5, 5, 5. Now you're saying that if you get more than 1.254 million acre ft. there won't be any sharing ratio.

(Mr. Hall) Of course there won't because I'm asking for a primary demand on the River. You're saying that I cannot get it, well that's another issue. If I come home without the water you can get up and criticize me. If I come home with 1½ million acre ft. primary demand on the River, what would you say?

(Mr. Dunstan) What I'd simply say to you is you are not getting, by simply getting an agreement to 1.5 million acre ft., when at the moment we have got an entitlement of 1.254 million acre ft. That's our entitlement now.

(Mr. Hall) Correct.

(Mr. Dunstan) That's what the agreement says. You want to

make a change to 1.5 million acre ft. But, as is the case now, if the water isn't there we don't get it. Now in a year of restriction, and a year of restriction is posculated quite clearly by the Committee, we wouldn't be getting it. If we have got Chowilla on our door-step we have got the water, not an agreement that we'll get it. We've got the water.

(Mr. Hall) Let me say in answer to that the 260 additional studies made since Mr. Dunstan was in office, made since Sir Thomas Playford was in office, when they operated on 13, has shown that in all of the 55 to 60 years studied in the comprehensive computer considerations of yield, input and output of the whole River system has proven beyond doubt that this extra yield is available from Dartmouth and we will negotiate for our share of it.

(Mr. Dunstan) Well, of course, what you are doing to negotiate for a share of the supposed extra water from Dartmouth is to say right, now we have voted for Dartmouth, we are on record as saying we think it is the better storage and we are on record as saying we think it is the better storage. --

(Mr. Hall) On condition only.

(Mr. Dunstan) The point is that we are still on record, whether we have attached conditions to it or not, we are on record before the River Murray Commission of saying that we think that Dartmouth is the better storage and it would yield more. How, then, have you got any sort of protection for South Australia in proposing to go to arbitration about Chowilla, which is your only protection?

(Mr. Hall) Not at all. We have to agree to the Dartmouth Dam before it can be built. Isn't that a strong point?

(Mr. Dunstan) Well you're not going to get Chowilla all the same.

(Mr. Hall) Our Commissioner has instructed the Commission we will agree to Dartmouth on this condition of $1\frac{1}{2}$ million acre ft. Without it, it's off and we are back to Chowilla. The Commission knows it and our Commissioner has made it quite plain to all concerned.

(Mr. Dunstan) And how do you think you'll fare before an arbitrator if after this, and after this decision of the Commission, you go back to an arbitrator and say we believe Chowilla is the better show and that we should have it?

(Mr. Hall) Well, I expect to do a lot better in my negotiations than you did when you went to the other States of Australia and said if you are not going to give us Chowilla, give us something equal to it. $1\frac{1}{4}$ million acre ft.

Here's the thing here written --

(Mr. Dunstan) Oh no, it doesn't say that and you're mis-quoting as you usually do.

(Mr. Hall) Not at all.

(Prof. Castles) Well let's perhaps clarify this. Mr. Hall could you lead off and Mr. Dunstan perhaps try to clarify the situation,

(Mr. Dunstan) Mr. Hall has just made a quotation and said certain things. Let me read the quotation ---

(Prof. Castles) Let us have Mr. Hall's one first Mr. Dunstan and then perhaps you could read yours.

(Mr. Hall) I think it's the same one --- we have the same thing.

(Mr. Dunstan) --- we have the same quotation and there is no mention of 1.254 million acre ft.

(Mr. Hall) No, there's not, there's not in this particular one, no. But you are asking for the same benefits that would come from Chowilla.

(Mr. Dunstan) I asked that South Australia be guaranteed the benefits that Chowilla was designed to provide.

(Mr. Hall) Exactly.

(Mr. Dunstan) That was the most that could possibly be achieved interstate at the time that the investigations were going on. I have explained why investigations were going on and you, in fact, have accepted the necessity for them.

(Mr. Hall) I have accepted this report as being factual.

(Mr. Dunstan) And you've accepted the necessity for the investigations -- you've been saying the whole evening we've had these studies and these have shown these things. Do you think we would have been able to achieve the decision of a Commissioner to build Chowilla without those investigations, when the Commission had said that new factors had arisen? Of course we would have had to get the result of a Technical Committee's report to go to an arbitrator. What do you think that we should have done otherwise?

(Mr. Hall) Let me tell you where you stand on arbitration, and this is a report from the Crown Solicitor. The Chowilla works were provided for by the agreement approved by the River Murray Waters Act Amendment Act, 1963, and are therefore works over which the Commission has control. Under Clause 28 of the Agreement the Commission has full power to give directions as to the order in point of time of the construction of particular works being part of the works to be constructed by any of the State Governments.

And, in fact, this means that like the north-south railway to Darwin we could have Chowilla as an existing programme and it could be scheduled for 50 years hence, and nothing in challenge of court will affect that. There can be no challenge to this.

(Mr. Dunstan) Why don't you read the section in the Agreement. The section in the Agreement says that any dispute in relation to the building of projects may be taken to an arbitrator.

(Prof. Castles) Well let's come back at this point. I think we should clarify this. It seems important. Mr. Hall --

(Mr. Hall) Of course it's important. Yes. And the Crown Solicitor goes on to say, of course, that the arbitrator, whoever he is, and he may in the first instance be the Chief Justice of Tasmania or someone he appoints --

(Mr. Dunstan) No. Someone he appoints.

(Mr. Hall) Someone he appoints -- he will have to study the very things that we are looking at here in these Technical Reports. He can do nothing else if a contentious issue based on technical grounds is put to him. And I put this to you. If this had been submitted to arbitration and if the Commissioner or the arbitrator, if the arbitrator at that time had found against Chowilla, we would take what we were given. There would be no negotiating point left for South Australia.

(Prof. Castles) Mr. Dunstan.

(Mr. Dunstan) That's perfectly true. But what have you got now? You haven't even got a bargaining point at this stage --

(Mr. Hall) At this point we have a very real bargaining point and it is the ability to prevent the building of the Dartmouth Dam if we so desire and the ability to once again promote Chowilla. And let me say this. The Government at no time has said that Chowilla is an undesirable storage. I want to make that quite clear, and I can quote from my statement in the House of last Tuesday to back that up. We have said at all times that Chowilla will be built one day.

(Mr. Dunstan) Well, at the moment it seems to be in the very dim and distant future on the decisions that you have made in relation to this.

(Mr. Hall) If we get 1½ million acre ft. it will obviously be a second stage in the River Murray.

(Mr. Dunstan) Well, I hope it will be a second stage in the River Murray, if we are ever to get it, if you're going to go on in the way that you are. But how can you possibly say that we should give up this storage which is vital to us in the regulation of our section of the River, when you know what the situation is

that we have faced concerning salinity from the other States and when the Technical Committee itself has said that there are advantages in favour of Chowilla on salinity?

(Mr. Hall) Well of course there is a very real answer to this. The very fact that we increase our entitlement will increase our flow through South Australia. This in itself reduces the salinity per measure of the water that comes into this State. In addition, one of the conditions that we have allied ~~xxxxxx~~ to our demand for $1\frac{1}{2}$ million acre ft. is the renovation of Lake Victoria and Lake Victoria, when renovated, will be able to take in and let out water something in the order of four to five times its present capacity and this, holding 400,000 acre ft., is the answer to the short term management of the River. And so we say if we have this answer, if we have the ability to say to our growers on the River who remember at the present time are facing with a quota of $1\frac{1}{4}$ million acre ft. a situation of over-committment - now - we are committed to for future known diversions in the River for a figure which will not be covered by $1\frac{1}{4}$ million acre ft. Now am I to say to them I'll take the Lake, still under River Murray Commission management at our door-step, and you will go short of water or am I to say we'll take, as a first stage on the Murray, the Dartmouth scheme, give you management through Lake Victoria, will purchase for another \$2 million as far as South Australia is concerned as our component share of the total cost, for another \$2 million will obtain 35% increase in our divertible water. And there's only one answer that can be given.

(Mr. Dunstan) I can't see this.

(Prof. Castles) Time is running out so we had better get to the bottom of this.

(Mr. Dunstan) Well, there's still one more thing that I want to do because you have still not answered the question which I asked you previously about the Technical Committee's own statements concerning the benefits which Chowilla will give as compared to the Dartmouth scheme with the Lake Victoria renovations.

(Mr. Hall) You are referring to the benefits ^{to} ~~in~~ the other States?

(Mr. Dunstan) The benefits to us in control of salinity.

(Mr. Hall) Oh, look, I think that the Leader of the Opposition has misread this.

(Mr. Dunstan) Oh no, I haven't.

(Mr. Hall) Well look, I wonder could I ask you do you know that this table doesn't start at December it starts on the 1st of May - this salinity table - and, in fact, if you read it carefully you will find that the peak of salinities as compared with

Chowilla and Dartmouth are in favour of Dartmouth at the peak times of demand on the River.....

(Mr. Dunstan) That's certainly not my ----

(Mr. Hall) and it's simply like this that during the winter Chowilla would have provided lower salinity flows in the River, but during the summer Dartmouth provides the lower salinity flows. This is when the demand takes place --- this table starts from the 1st of May.

(Mr. Dunstan) I have had a look at the table but this is what the Committee says and this is the general conclusion. - "A storage at ~~Dartmouth~~ Chowilla will have a smoothing effect on salinity and except for very few occasions would maintain an average salinity below lock 6 of about 20 parts per million below the average that would pertain with a storage at Dartmouth, and it is quite clear on the graph that most of the peaks show advantages in favour of Chowilla.

(Mr. Hall) ~~That~~ The facts are that Chowilla does smooth out the salinity of the River, but Dartmouth gives lower salinity in summer and higher in winter and, in fact, the comparisons that are made are that the average salinity out of Chowilla ~~xxx~~ is 180 parts per million and the average salinity out of Dartmouth is 200. So there is marginally something in favour of Chowilla as regards salinity. But this is only a small amount.

(Mr. Dunstan) It's not only marginally, just have a look over the whole of this graph.....

(Prof. Castles) I'm afraid the viewers can't see

(Mr. Dunstan) No the viewers can't see. The peaks of salinity that occur over practically the whole area of the graph are greater for Dartmouth than they are for Chowilla.

(Mr. Hall) No, I'm afraid this is quite the opposite if you read it properly because the peaks are with Dartmouth - it peaks high, it peaks low, Chowilla smooths. The report ~~says~~ ^{says} ~~it~~ it itself.

(Prof. Castles) Well I'm afraid gentlemen this is going to have to be one of the unresolved issues ---

(Mr. Hall) Well, it's not an important issue anyway.

(Prof. Castles) --- to tonight's debate. I think there were a number of other questions that were raised and thrown at Mr. Hall and back at Mr. Dunstan, but time is running out on us as it always does with this sort of thing. I think it has been a remarkably interesting debate, I think it's been a unique experience to have two people like this debating at this level on television. Now, finally, I would like to call firstly upon Mr.

Dunstan to sum up and say what he will in 1½ minutes to conclude his remarks in tonight's discussion and then I'll be calling on Mr. Steele Hall to have 1½ minutes as well. Mr. Dunstan.

(Mr. Dunstan) The Chowilla proposal was designed to do two major things for South Australia. It was to provide us with extra water to make quite certain that we wouldn't be restricted in probable dry years except perhaps one year in fifty, so that we would be able to get extra water for South Australia. And that we would be able to control the kind of water that was coming into South Australia since we cannot control how much salt is put into the water in certain areas in the other States up river of us. Those two benefits, plus a general regulation of the River, have been studied by hydrologists in South Australia, including Mr. Warren Bonython, to be benefits which cannot be provided by an alternative storage at Dartmouth. The regulation of the River by water right on our door-step is something which is vitally important in our view to South Australia. I do not believe that the Dartmouth proposal can give us the same kind of guarantee and in view of the way in which the other State's haven't gone along ~~with~~ with our guarantees, I am not prepared to rely on what they say now.

(Prof. Castles) Mr. Hall.

(Mr. Hall) Well, let me say that in all times the other States have co-operated properly and correctly in the River Murray Commission. The only contention has been whether or not the Chowilla Dam should be built.

~~It~~ It's time South Australia stopped talking as if we had the choice of Chowilla or Dartmouth. We no longer have a choice. We have not had a choice since 1967 when it was deferred, and the deferrment was agreed to by the previous Government. Now if we look at it in this light we will try and get the obvious best advantages for this State. We are lucky, extremely lucky, that the Technical Committee which has now reported has found that more water can be provided in greatly increased quantities in the River Murray system, because that gives us a chance to negotiate for it. The quality difference between the two dams is marginal; the cost difference is marginal. What manner of man would I be, what manner of men would my Cabinet be if they said to the people of South Australia we like the look of the dam here but we will deny you an increase in the divertible water of 35%. We can't. We will not.

(Prof. Castles) Gentlemen, thank you very much indeed for taking part in this unique occasion. The Chowilla controversy as I am sure everyone will agree is one which has gripped the minds not only of the people of South Australia, it's gripped the minds of the leaders of the main political parties in this State.

Tonight we have been very greatly priveleged to have our Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in the South Australian Parliament speak so openly and so frankly to the people of this State on an issue which I am sure we all know could well hold the key to the future wealth and the future prosperity of the State of South Australia. Goodnight.

(Announcer) Ladies and gentlemen, we hope you will join us in thanking the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition for making this debate possible. We must also thank Professor Alex Castles in his capacity as Chairman. This was a live non-commercial telecast presented by NWS-9 in the interests of public affairs.

10-2-69 NW 59 Live 7.30-8.30 3600
Tonight for the first time in South Australia, and as far as we know for the first time in the history of Australian television, a Leader of a Government and a Leader of an Opposition have agreed to debate together on a matter of outstanding importance to the matter of this State and, indeed, for the people of Australia as a whole. But before Mr. Steele Hall and Mr. Dunstan come into the studio, we are to have 15 minutes or so discussing the background to the decision of the River Murray Commission to recommend that work on the Chowilla Dam should not be resumed at this stage and instead planning should proceed immediately for a new water storage on the Murray River system at Dartmouth on the Mitta Mitta River in Victoria. To take part in this discussion we have with us Mr. H.L. Beaney, the Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department of South Australia and South Australia's Commissioner on the River Murray Commission; and on my right Mr. A.M. Kinnear, the E. & W.S.'s Assistant Engineer for Irrigation and Drainage and South Australia's representative on the Technical Committee of the River Murray Commission.

The Technical Committee is the body which reported to the Commission last January on the advantages of the Dartmouth Dam in preference to going ahead with the Chowilla scheme at this stage. By its recent decision the River Murray Commission has reversed its stand, which it took in 1961, which recommended that the provision of a large water storage at Chowilla would be the most effective and economical means of regulating the waters of the River Murray to give greater security, particularly in times of drought, to the people of Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia. These three States, together with the Commonwealth, make up the membership on the Commission and each Government appoints a part-time Commissioner to this particular Commission, but under the River Murray Agreement, which controls the work of the Commission, all major decisions by the Commission must be unanimous and failing such agreement the matter must be referred to an independent arbitrator.

Tonight, neither the Premier nor the Leader of the Opposition will themselves direct questions to the two South Australian representatives with me, who have been so closely involved in the decision to recommend that Chowilla should be shelved at least for the time being, and in its place work should begin as soon as possible on a new dam at Dartmouth. Instead I have been given a series of questions prepared by Mr. Steele Hall and Mr. Dunstan and at my own discretion and if time allows I have been asked by these two gentlemen to put these questions to either Mr. Beaney or to Mr. Kinnear. I do not propose to announce from whom the questions have come and without further ado I would now like to direct my first question, which is quite a general one, to both Mr. Beaney and to Mr. Kinnear.

Gentlemen, as I understand it, the River Murray Commission in deciding back in 1961 to recommend Chowilla in preference to any other new major storage on the Murray River system had the advantage of what the present Minister for National Development, Mr. Fairbairn, then described and I quote from Hansard 'had the advantage of a comprehensive and a complex investigation'. Why then gentlemen has Dartmouth now been recommended by the River Murray Commission in preference to Chowilla after this particular examination and study, which seems to have been so detailed? Perhaps Mr. Beaney you could lead off for us.

(Mr. Beaney) The original concept of Chowilla came from South Australia. It was proposed by South Australia to the Commission and was very thoroughly investigated by the Commission on certain assumptions that were made back in the beginning of this decade, and it was very definitely shown that not only South Australia but the two upper States of New South Wales and Victoria could win considerable advantages from the operation of this storage. Tenders were called and the price escalated to a rather high level which made the upper States query the advantages that might be had from this storage and the cost of water to themselves. We had also experienced some rather poor River conditions with poor quality water as we had last summer and this highlighted certain operational procedures which had been introduced in the earliest days which were no longer tenable, and the Commission instructed that further studies be made. These would show that the overall benefit of a storage at Dartmouth will benefit the system by something like 860,000 acre ft. more water than could be taken out of the Chowilla system, and each State is in a position to share in this water.

Alright. Now you weren't on the Technical Committee, of course, which made this report last year with respect to the feasibility of the Dartmouth scheme and made some comparisons with the Chowilla scheme. I understand, Mr. Kinnear, you were the South Australian representative on the Technical Committee which did this detailed study which resulted in reversing the previous decision. Now have you anything to add to what Mr. Beaney just told us about the change in front of the Commission on this issue?

(Mr. Kinnear) Well, Professor Castles, the end result of the studies support Mr. Beaney's statement that with Chowilla Dam South Australia could receive 1.254 million acre ft. a year and there would not be sufficient additional yield to satisfy the requirements of the two eastern States.

(Prof. Castles) So, in other words, as a result of your particular report last year the two states of New South Wales and Victoria will, in fact, be getting an increased allotment.

Does this mean that South Australia will be getting the same allotment which it would have had otherwise if the Chowilla Scheme had have been continued with?

(Mr. Kinnear) There is potential for a greater allotment for South Australia with the Dartmouth Scheme and it will also more than satisfy the needs for the upper States as at present.

(Prof. Castles) Now you don't think Chowilla Scheme would have, in fact, done this for the upper States after examining all the technical problems that you have been involved in?

(Mr. Kinnear) No, I don't.

(Prof. Castles) Now, in these circumstances too, one of the problems which many people face I think in worrying about Chowilla, is the fact that back when the scheme was originally brought out and originally approved by the Parliaments of Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia and the Commonwealth Parliament, one thing which was important in the minds of most of us was that there was a need to maximise the storage of water for South Australia, particularly at a time of drought, and at the same time to ensure that in a period of drought South Australia would continue to get an adequate supply of water for its industrial, its agricultural and its development of domestic supplies. Now, in your view, having been on the Technical Committee and studied this problem in such detail, do you believe that South Australia will get any less water than it would have got if it had, in fact, followed through with the Chowilla Scheme?

(Mr. Kinnear) I believe it has a potential for getting more water.

(Prof. Castles) Only a potential, you wouldn't say it would get more water?

(Mr. Kinnear) I feel, as a Technical man, that it's quite sensible to say it can get more water.

(Prof. Castles) Mr. Beaney, I was coming back to you to see what you felt about this.

(Mr. Beaney) Yes. Any acceptance or any approval or any agreement that I have made in supporting Dartmouth is conditional on South Australia getting more water.

(Prof. Castles) In other words it's completely conditional that we must get more water out of Dartmouth than we would have got out of Chowilla?

(Mr. Beaney) This is the only reason for South Australia's support and we can get quite a large increase on our entitlement out of the Dartmouth Scheme. It is capable of giving it to us.

(Prof. Castles) Well, can I raise this question with you. One of the questions that has been given to me which runs along these lines. What guarantee have we then, Mr. Beaney, that if New South Wales and Victoria get extra water from Dartmouth further uncontrolled development will not occur in these States again creating excess demand for water in Victoria and New South Wales and so adversely affecting the salinity problem in South Australia?

(Mr. Beaney) You raise a number of issues there.

(Prof. Castles) This isn't one of our questions. This is one we have been asked to put forward to you.

(Mr. Beaney) Just a couple of notes on this. The degree of development cannot be controlled by the River Murray Commission. The amount of water provided to the upper States and to the three States, in fact, is controlled by the Commission and the Commission is in a position to fairly distribute the water that has been allowed to the three States. In other words, South Australia's entitlement plus the proportion of the demand that the upper States can take while still providing South Australia's entitlement.

(Prof. Castles) So you think we still get our entitlement?

(Mr. Beaney) I'm quite sure we can.

(Prof. Castles) Now can I ask you another question here. I understand there has been an excess demand by New South Wales and Victoria that New South Wales and Victoria's requirements are stated to be 2.7 million acre ft. per year to satisfy their existing needs as against the present supply to them of 2.084 million acre ft. per year. Now are these figures reasonably accurate?

(Mr. Beaney) They sound about right.

(Prof. Castles) Yes. Now has this excess demand by Victoria and by New South Wales been produced by uncontrolled development of irrigation settlements in New South Wales and Victoria? I understand, and the viewers might not realise, that in fact the River Murray Commission doesn't control the tributaries of the Murray below Albury. Now I think this question is aimed at asking is the uncontrolled development of irrigation settlements below Albury causing an excess demand in Victoria and New South Wales which has adversely affected our position with respect to this water scheme?

(Mr. Beaney) It has not adversely affected our position. Under the original Chowilla proposal the upper States were promised approximately 2.8 million acre ft. per year and so really, they are living within the area of the promise that Chowilla was to confer on them or the benefits that Chowilla was to confer.

(Prof. Castles) And as you see it there will be no real variation in the water entitlements?

(Mr. Beaney) I can see no variation. I can't say that the upper States will limit their irrigation but they must limit with available water and the available water to them out of the Dartmouth Scheme will confirm something of the order of this 2.8, which Chowilla can no longer do, and they will be in a position to get the benefit while we can still take out 1½ million acre ft., which we are asking for.

(Prof. Castles) I see. And so with these circumstances you think that the situation will be much the same. Now can I raise another issue. Perhaps Mr. Kinnear was involved in the Technical debate on this, and as far as South Australia is concerned, we will be seemingly getting much the same sort of water supplies coming through with the Dartmouth Scheme, but this is in normal years. Now I noticed in the report that you were a party to that, in fact, there are problems with respect to drought years. Now, it seems to me, that periods of restriction are periods of real concern to South Australia. If I understand it rightly, in 1959, something like 80% of our water supplies were drawn from the Murray system during a period of shortage of water. Now, in this situation, is South Australia going to be able to, in a sense, have a maximum supply of water during drought periods in the same way that it would have had a maximum supply, so we thought, under the Chowilla Scheme? In other words, are we going to get the same amount of water in a period of drought with Dartmouth as we would have got with the Chowilla Scheme?

(Mr. Kinnear) The Technical Committee examined the situation with a Dartmouth under varying conditions of restrictions that each State could expect to find. We determined that with flows of the order of 1.5 million acre ft. per year it would seem that South Australia could remain unrestricted in all years. We ran a check study on this and this did, in fact, confirm that there is every indication technically that you could ask for 1.5 million acre ft., you could expect it to be supplied and the eastern States could also, even under those conditions, expect a satisfactory yield to them.

(Prof. Castles) So you don't think we will suffer greatly because of this?

(Mr. Kinnear) I don't.

(Prof. Castles) Well, gentlemen, I see our time has almost expired. Can I ask you one final question and can I ask it to each of you? Now I think that this is a question of real importance to all of us. Does the decision to recommend Dartmouth mean that

Chowilla will never be built? Mr. Beaney, firstly.

(Mr. Beaney) Certainly not. The decision to recommend Dartmouth with the support of South Australia on the assumption that we get an increased entitlement, is based on the conditions in the next decade. We all realise that this will not be the final development in the Murray. Further storages will be necessary and I think there is a very high likelihood that Chowilla would be the most favourable storage to follow Dartmouth.

(Prof. Castles) Would you agree with that Mr. Kinnear?

(Mr. Kinnear) I would.

(Prof. Castles) So you both believe, then, that Chowilla could well be built at some time in the future, after the Dartmouth scheme has been completed?

(Mr. Kinnear) I think this is accepted.

(Prof. Castles) Alright. Well thank you very much gentlemen. It's been a great pleasure to speak with you this evening and I'm sure that you have helped to illuminate a number of the problems which have been concerning the people of South Australia over this very interesting and very complicated Chowilla controversy.

(Mr. Hall) The choice of whether South Australia gets its guarantee of water in the future from Chowilla or Dartmouth rests upon the results of a Technical Committee, a Technical Committee of the River Murray Commission, a Commission which will control and build the dam, whether it is built at Chowilla or elsewhere in some other State, a Committee which was set up in 1967 with the approval of Mr. Dunstan, the then Premier of South Australia. That Committee has since reported and my Cabinet and I have questioned this Committee for many days and Mr. Beaney is well aware of the searching questions we put to him trying to find flaws in a report which we have found in the end to be correct. And, therefore, we have accepted this report as being the grounds for giving us the opportunity in South Australia to negotiate for a substantial increase in South Australia's water supply.

Now, Mr. Dunstan has not accepted the conclusions of the report that he approved in 1967. With what authority does he now attack the judgement of the South Australian River Murray Commissioner and say that he has accepted a slanted report? Both Sir Thomas Playford and Mr. Dunstan has said that they do not quarrel with the precise technical details of the Technical Committee, but they question the assumptions it has made.

What on earth do they mean when they question the assumptions, when they say it was wrong for the Committee to study the base flow at Mildura, to study the inclusion of the Menindie Lakes, to study a storage at Dartmouth on the Mitta River? Who agreed to these assumptions? Let me go back to the Commission's meeting in August 11th, 1967, when the South Australian Commissioner agreed that the Technical Committee should determine the pattern of future studies and refer these to the Commission for their concurrence before proceeding. These studies were to include further study of the Chowilla proposal, the value of the Dartmouth Dam, storage possibilities at Lake , the continued use of the Menindie Lakes, equal sharing by the three States and the possibility of South Australia being unrestricted at all times. What happened then? The Commissioner returned to South Australia and there was a Debate in the House and many questions. The then Premier, Mr. Dunstan, said we could have told the Commissioner to get the best results that he could for this State and that was his instruction. He was instructed to get the best he could within his discretion for this State. Now, it so happens that the Commissioner went back to a following meeting of the Commission after he had reported to Mr. Dunstan and after there had been a debate in the House. And what did he do after he had seen Mr. Dunstan? He joined in recommending, on the 10th of October, 1967, that the Commission should have a plan of studies. It was considered that there should be studies made up of combinations of the following: Menindie Lakes operated as a River Murray Commission storage or as a New South Wales storage; sharing restrictions; minimum supplies to South Australia; minimum supplies to upper States; minimum flow in the River Murray upstream and the Darling junction; and in the second part the use of the Euston storage; the use of selected capacities of Upper Murray or Mitta storages; Murray Gates, Dartmouth or Gibbo; determination of the capacity of Chowilla necessary to ensure that South Australia always received its full entitlement and the use of the Buffalo storage, the very things that Mr. Dunstan now questions and says it should not be assumed by the Commission.

Now, Sir, the basic problems of Chowilla are these. That, firstly, it allowed no flow in the River at Mildura and, secondly, there were only thirteen manual studies backing the benefits that were supposed to come from Chowilla, and since doubts were raised on costs and salinity, the Technical Committee has been set up with the approval of the then Government and has made 260 complete studies of the River Murray system and it has recognised, in addition, there must be a base flow in the River at Mildura, just as the River Murray Commission has always recommended that and provided for a base flow in the River through South Australia.

South Australia has done more to conserve and distribute its water resources per capita than any other State in Australia. My Government is planning decades ahead and, at this moment, is considering what is termed water harvesting by pumping from the Teale Flat Dam of the future to a huge pipeline, to a large storage yet to be constructed in the Adelaide Hills. And yet Mr. Dunstan attacked our handling of the River Murray system last Tuesday in the House in a speech which had eleven mis-statements and errors in fact. One of his supporting speakers, the Member for Edwardstown said who has got at the Government? One wonders there is not some bribery and corruption somewhere. Is this the sort of approach one should make, as responsible Members of Parliament, concerning one of the most vital issues that will ever face the South Australian public? What authority has Mr. Dunstan to say that my Government stop the Chowilla project, when he agreed to its deferrment in August 1967, and agreed then to the setting up of a Technical Committee which he so vigorously opposes in its findings now? Chowilla died as a first storage on the River Murray system when Mr. Dunstan hawked a letter, or a statement of intent, through to the other Premiers and the Commonwealth of Australia. When he reported this to the newspapers, it was printed in the "Advertiser" on the 15th of November, 1967. Let me read what his statement of intent to the other Premiers was. -- The present studies being carried out by the River Commission are for the purpose of exploring the maximum use that can be made of the waters of the River Murray. It has been indicated earlier that by the construction of the Chowilla Dam South Australia would gain considerable relief from periodic restriction of reply and the upstream States would also benefit. The decision to defer construction of the Chowilla Dam arose from factors not previously established. Current investigations are aimed at developing an economic plan to sustain the advantages mentioned. It was left to our party in Opposition to strengthen the claim for Chowilla and this led to our election platform when we re-stated our fight for Chowilla, and since then to the pamphlet "The 14 Facts on Chowilla" where we re-established our fight for a South Australian storage. What authority does he have to say that the Hume Dam rarely fills, when in fact it's filled 26 out of the 35 years of its existence, and between the years 1945 and 1964 it filled 18 years out of 20? And even though it has been increased in size by a quarter since 1961, it will fill more often than not in the future. Who on earth advised him to say there is no adequate information on the flow of the Mitta River when, in fact, the 60 years study made of the River system was based on adjusted calculated flows that had existed for the measurement of the Mitta since 1885? What special dispensation enables Mr.

Dunstan to ignore page 6 and page 8 of the Technical Committee's report where he says that no mention is made of South Australian yield or possible gain for this State where, in fact, it is quite clearly stated there that the Committee considered these matters? What peculiar logic gives him the right to say we already have an increased entitlement through the Chowilla Scheme when, in fact, the Agreement clearly states that in a year of restriction all States would then share on a third equal basis of that quota already established of 1¼ million acre ft? From the study I made of the Chowilla situation and the Dartmouth comparison and from the advice that I have received, I believe that this is the last chance that South Australia will have to increase its water entitlement. We will have a chance to build more dams but this is the last chance to increase the entitlement. Do we throw this away in some strange mass exercise of self denial or do we grasp the opportunity and increase our entitlement for future development? My answer is clear. I will fight for the future, regardless of the political consequences at this time.

(Prof. Castles) Thank you very much Mr. Premier. And now without any further ado we turn to the Leader of the Opposition and former State Premier, Mr. Don Dunstan, who will now reply to the Premier's remarks. Mr. Dunstan.

(Mr. Dunstan) Thank you Professor. Our water supply in South Australia is too important a subject for political bickering. We all ought to fight to ensure the water supply. This is the driest part of the driest continent in the world and we can't develop without water. New South Wales and Victoria depend on the Murray for water for irrigation only and for the Murray towns, but the Murray is our lifeline in South Australia providing not merely irrigation but water for industry from Whyalla to Adelaide and the basis of domestic and farm water for 85% of our people. Now the most important questions for us are not just how much water comes down the Murray to us in a normal year, but, firstly, since the flow fluctuates widely from year to year, how often dry years occur in which there will be insufficient water for our needs and how much water we can regularly count on taking out of the Murray, even in a dry year to keep trees and vines and irrigation areas alive and industry going, and, secondly, what quality of water will we get? The River Murray Commission, in which we take part, has no control over the tributaries of the Murray in New South Wales and Victoria west of Albury, and so if they go in for careless irrigation practices and put very salty water down the River to us as they have done, all we can do is protest and ~~hear~~ Sir Henry Bolte and Mr. Askin say: Well, we are very sorry. We'll try not to let it happen again.

Now, the Chowilla Dam was designed to cope with these two basic needs of South Australia. We have heard something about the first, we haven't heard much about the second tonight. By providing an enormous body of fresh water at the head of our section of the Murray it could impound water from all the major Rivers flowing into the Murray and fill at flood time. It would reduce from one year in ten to one year in fifty the years in which there would be less than our minimum normal flow in the River and in which we would have to reduce the water we take out of it. This, on the advice given to the Government by the previous Engineer-in-Chief, would increase effectively the amount we could safely take out of the Murray by up to 300,000 acre ft. per year because the water would be right there. What is more, the peaks of very salty water coming from up-river would be smoothed out by this large body of fresh water acting as a buffer between us and the other States, so that we could be assured of good water. Now we got the agreement to build Chowilla in exchange for our rights in waters which were diverted in the Snowy Scheme from the Murray to the Murrumbidgee. Victoria and New South Wales got the whole benefit from the Snowy Scheme. With Chowilla it was our turn to get a major work for our benefit. New South Wales and Victoria were to benefit also because they wouldn't have to provide us with water in a dry year. They would be able to use all the resources upstream of Chowilla themselves instead of giving us a share and we would get our water from Chowilla. The agreement ratified unanimously, as you have been told, by the four Parliaments concerned provided the Commission could spend \$32 million on Chowilla. When the design was finished the cost had risen to \$43 million. All parties agreed to that. And then when the tenders came in the lowest tender was \$68 million. Unfortunately, as Mr. Beaney has said, at the same time there had been a build-up of salt in the River to a degree previously unknown. The upstream States thought that they would have to keep sending water down to us in a dry year, even with Chowilla there, merely to wash the salt out and, therefore, they wouldn't get the benefits they thought they would. And they refused to let a contract to build Chowilla until they had the studies made to see whether the water could be provided more cheaply and what the real effect on Chowilla was of the salt in the River and how saltiness over the whole length of the River could be controlled. Now at that stage there were two alternatives for South Australia and only two. We would agree to the studies being made or we could go to arbitration as provided in the Agreement to try to force the arbitrator to direct the building of Chowilla. The difficulty about that was, of course, that the cost of Chowilla exceeded the amount shown in the agreement. If we went to arbitration at that stage, then the arbitrator would certainly have asked for the information from the studies

before he made up his mind. It would merely have taken us longer to enforce our rights. Our engineers advised us then, rightly as it turns out, that the studies would show that any other way of providing the water would be at least as costly, that saltiness would be reduced by Chowilla and that there was no other way of giving all the benefits to South Australia that Chowilla would provide. We knew we would be in a strong position to go to arbitration and enforce the agreement. At the time I was bitterly attacked by Mr. Hall for agreeing to the studies, studies that he now says he relies on. I asked him then, and since, if he believed we should have gone to arbitration at once, the only other course open. I have never had an answer.

Now we have the report of the Technical Committee. It disposes of the two major objections to Chowilla - cost and salinity. In fact, it shows that there will be quite a bit less salt at peak periods than without Chowilla. Nevertheless, the Government has drawn a conclusion from the report that it should support a dam at Dartmouth instead of Chowilla. The dam at Dartmouth would be a thousand river miles away from South Australia and the water would take six weeks or more to get here. The earliest possible completion date would be 1973 and it would take four years to fill, so you wouldn't get the full benefit for quite a few years. But the report has some strange features. The studies of the benefits of Dartmouth were designed to find, and this is expressed in the report, how extra water could be given to New South Wales and Victoria while maintaining the minimum flow of water to South Australia other than in an especially dry year. In other words, because New South Wales and Victoria have allowed vines and trees to be planted needing water, they now want the extra water for themselves without giving us the guarantee of the extra water and protection from restriction in dry years that Chowilla would have provided. Now this is the basis upon which they are breaking the solemn agreement made with us, and I ask Mr. Hall seeing the Chowilla agreement is being broken in favour of extra water for New South Wales and Victorian planters, broken because they were not to provide us with a flow in the River which they now base breaking the agreement on, what guarantee have we that any other agreement will be kept? Moreover, since our bargaining position to get anything out of the present situation depended on our right to go to arbitration and enforce our right to the building of Chowilla, why have you thrown that right away by having our representative vote to ditch Chowilla in favour of Dartmouth? I ask you too, as Minister for Industrial Development, how you can advocate giving away the injection of about \$60 millions into the South Australian economy and give it to Sir Henry Bolte instead? There had been talk about helping the private earth-moving industry in South Australia. Chowilla would

have been the largest single soil engineering project in the State's history, and in any overseas trip to attract industry here, what industry or group of industries could be got which would produce an investment of that size with the resulting deployment, housing, business, railway undertakings and engineering experiences. Could I ask you lastly, since this seems to have been the basis of your statements, on this particular matter recently leading to this debate, do you really say that opposition to the course that you are now following is merely party politics? We are not playing party politics. We are continuing the fight for Chowilla which Sir Thomas Playford began. Are you accusing Sir Thomas Playford of playing party politics when he disagrees with what you have done? I believe that he is honestly seeking what he believes to be right for South Australia and what has been shown necessarily to be the real benefit for South Australia in ensuring water storage, an assurance which was spoken of in Mr. Bonython's recent lecture after he, like Sir Thomas Playford, had consulted with Mr. Beaney. Speaking of the benefits which I have spoken of at Chowilla he said: Perhaps a dam at Dartmouth will do some of these things, it cannot do all of them.

(Mr. Hall) Professor, what Mr. Dunstan has done is to restate the problem and throw up a number of questions based on as many inaccuracies as his debate in the House.

(Prof. Castles) There was one question he asked at the beginning. He did say that Chowilla would reduce from one in ten to one in fifty years the period in which we will have to reduce our intake from the Murray River system. This seemed to me to be a key fact --

(Mr. Hall) This, of course, is not strictly correct although his intention is correct. Chowilla as now planned would guarantee our water supply in South Australia in all the years that have been studied in the 55 years of Chowilla research without restriction at 1¼ million acre ft., all of them. However, Dartmouth has the capacity, if I am able to negotiate 1½ million acre ft. out of the other States and out of the Commonwealth to supply a guarantee to South Australia over all of those years that have been studied for 1½ million acre ft. Now let me remind you that the divertible components of our allocation is not the whole, because 564,000 acre ft. of our 1¼ million is dilution water which is wasted because of evaporation or dilution down the River, and the increase that I am seeking on our divertible component is 35%. Now, does Mr. Dunstan say forget it, don't ask for it? And this, of course, is why this report dealt with it as he is now criticizing it. It said we assume for South

Australia $1\frac{1}{4}$ million acre ft. Why? Because that is all he ever asked for, and if he goes through his statements of intent or other reference that he has made, whenever he has mentioned a figure he's said let's guarantee $1\frac{1}{4}$ million acre ft. And that's why it's there. He never asked for any more.

(Mr. Dunstan) It is quite true that the Committee's report does assume 1.254 million acre ft. for South Australia, that's with Dartmouth. But it also takes very great care to say that our sharing ratio in years of restriction should be altered. Now if it's assuming, and if it's proved that there will never be years of restriction, why is it suggested that we ought to alter the sharing ratio in years of restriction to 5/15 instead of 3/30?

(Mr. Hall) The answer of course, Professor, is simple, because they have not taken us to get $1\frac{1}{2}$ million acre ft. They have assumed $1\frac{1}{4}$ and if I could negotiate the $1\frac{1}{2}$, obviously the sharing will not be of importance.

(Mr. Dunstan) But the sharing relates to a year of restriction.

(Mr. Hall) Well if I get what I have laid down as a condition for Dartmouth, there will not be a restriction below $1\frac{1}{2}$ million acre ft.

(Mr. Dunstan) Well that is what you are saying, But, in fact --

(Mr. Hall) What I am asking for too.

(Mr. Dunstan) Yes, but right at the moment what we have got in this report, and here are the three conditions set out here, is the conditions common to these studies are 1.254 million acre ft. South Australian, Menindie under the River Murray Commission and a sharing ratio of 5, 5, 5. Now you're saying that if you get more than 1.254 million acre ft. there won't be any sharing ratio.

(Mr. Hall) Of course there won't because I'm asking for a primary demand on the River. You're saying that I cannot get it, well that's another issue. If I come home without the water you can get up and criticize me. If I come home with $1\frac{1}{2}$ million acre ft. primary demand on the River, what would you say?

(Mr. Dunstan) What I'd simply say to you is you are not getting, by simply getting an agreement to 1.5 million acre ft., when at the moment we have got an entitlement of 1.254 million acre ft. That's our entitlement now.

(Mr. Hall) Correct.

(Mr. Dunstan) That's what the agreement says. You want to

make a change to 1.5 million acre ft. But, as is the case now, if the water isn't there we don't get it. Now in a year of restriction, and a year of restriction is posculated quite clearly by the Committee, we wouldn't be getting it. If we have got Chowilla on our door-step we have got the water, not an agreement that we'll get it. We've got the water.

(Mr. Hall) Let me say in answer to that the 260 additional studies made since Mr. Dunstan was in office, made since Sir Thomas Playford was in office, when they operated on 13, has shown that in all of the 55 to 60 years studied in the comprehensive computer considerations of yield, input and output of the whole River system has proven beyond doubt that this extra yield is available from Dartmouth and we will negotiate for our share of it.

(Mr. Dunstan) Well, of course, what you are doing to negotiate for a share of the supposed extra water from Dartmouth is to say right, now we have voted for Dartmouth, we are on record as saying we think it is the better storage and we are on record as saying we think it is the better storage. --

(Mr. Hall) On condition only.

(Mr. Dunstan) The point is that we are still on record, whether we have attached conditions to it or not, we are on record before the River Murray Commission of saying that we think that Dartmouth is the better storage and it would yield more. How, then, have you got any sort of protection for South Australia in proposing to go to arbitration about Chowilla, which is your only protection?

(Mr. Hall) Not at all. We have to agree to the Dartmouth Dam before it can be built. Isn't that a strong point?

(Mr. Dunstan) Well you're not going to get Chowilla all the same.

(Mr. Hall) Our Commissioner has instructed the Commission we will agree to Dartmouth on this condition of 1½ million acre ft. Without it, it's off and we are back to Chowilla. The Commission knows it and our Commissioner has made it quite plain to all concerned.

(Mr. Dunstan) And how do you think you'll fare before an arbitrator if after this, and after this decision of the Commission, you go back to an arbitrator and say we believe Chowilla is the better show and that we should have it?

(Mr. Hall) Well, I expect to do a lot better in my negotiations than you did when you went to the other States of Australia and said if you are not going to give us Chowilla, give us something equal to it. 1½ million acre ft.

Here's the thing here written --

(Mr. Dunstan) Oh no, it doesn't say that and you're mis-quoting as you usually do.

(Mr. Hall) Not at all.

(Prof. Castles) Well let's perhaps clarify this. Mr. Hall could you lead off and Mr. Dunstan perhaps try to clarify the situation,

(Mr. Dunstan) Mr. Hall has just made a quotation and said certain things. Let me read the quotation ---

(Prof. Castles) Let us have Mr. Hall's one first Mr. Dunstan and then perhaps you could read yours.

(Mr. Hall) I think it's the same one --- we have the same thing.

(Mr. Dunstan) --- we have the same quotation and there is no mention of 1.254 million acre ft.

(Mr. Hall) No, there's not, there's not in this particular one, no. But you are asking for the same benefits that would come from Chowilla.

(Mr. Dunstan) I asked that South Australia be guaranteed the benefits that Chowilla was designed to provide.

(Mr. Hall) Exactly.

(Mr. Dunstan) That was the most that could possibly be achieved interstate at the time that the investigations were going on. I have explained why investigations were going on and you, in fact, have accepted the necessity for them.

(Mr. Hall) I have accepted this report as being factual.

(Mr. Dunstan) And you've accepted the necessity for the investigations -- you've been saying the whole evening we've had these studies and these have shown these things. Do you think we would have been able to achieve the decision of a Commissioner to build Chowilla without those investigations, when the Commission had said that new factors had arisen? Of course we would have had to get the result of a Technical Committee's report to go to an arbitrator. What do you think that we should have done otherwise?

(Mr. Hall) Let me tell you where you stand on arbitration, and this is a report from the Crown Solicitor. The Chowilla works were provided for by the agreement approved by the River Murray Waters Act Amendment Act, 1963, and are therefore works over which the Commission has control. Under Clause 28 of the Agreement the Commission has full power to give directions as to the order in point of time of the construction of particular works being part of the works to be constructed by any of the State Governments.

And, in fact, this means that like the north-south railway to Darwin we could have Chowilla as an existing programme and it could be scheduled for 50 years hence, and nothing in challenge of court will affect that. There can be no challenge to this.

(Mr. Dunstan) Why don't you read the section in the Agreement. The section in the Agreement says that any dispute in relation to the building of projects may be taken to an arbitrator.

(Prof. Castles) Well let's come back at this point. I think we should clarify this. It seems important. Mr. Hall --

(Mr. Hall) Of course it's important. Yes. And the Crown Solicitor goes on to say, of course, that the arbitrator, whoever he is, and he may in the first instance be the Chief Justice of Tasmania or someone he appoints --

(Mr. Dunstan) No. Someone he appoints.

(Mr. Hall) Someone he appoints -- he will have to study the very things that we are looking at here in these Technical Reports. He can do nothing else if a contentious issue based on technical grounds is put to him. And I put this to you. If this had been submitted to arbitration and if the Commissioner or the arbitrator, if the arbitrator at that time had found against Chowilla, we would take what we were given. There would be no negotiating point left for South Australia.

(Prof. Castles) Mr. Dunstan.

(Mr. Dunstan) That's perfectly true. But what have you got now? You haven't even got a bargaining point at this stage --

(Mr. Hall) At this point we have a very real bargaining point and it is the ability to prevent the building of the Dartmouth Dam if we so desire and the ability to once again promote Chowilla. And let me say this. The Government at no time has said that Chowilla is an undesirable storage. I want to make that quite clear, and I can quote from my statement in the House of last Tuesday to back that up. We have said at all times that Chowilla will be built one day.

(Mr. Dunstan) Well, at the moment it seems to be in the very dim and distant future on the decisions that you have made in relation to this.

(Mr. Hall) If we get 1½ million acre ft. it will obviously be a second stage in the River Murray.

(Mr. Dunstan) Well, I hope it will be a second stage in the River Murray, if we are ever to get it, if you're going to go on in the way that you are. But how can you possibly say that we should give up this storage which is vital to us in the regulation of our section of the River, when you know what the situation is

that we have faced concerning salinity from the other States and when the Technical Committee itself has said that there are advantages in favour of Chowilla on salinity?

(Mr. Hall) Well of course there is a very real answer to this. The very fact that we increase our entitlement will increase our flow through South Australia. This in itself reduces the salinity per measure of the water that comes into this State. In addition, one of the conditions that we have allied ~~to~~ to our demand for $1\frac{1}{2}$ million acre ft. is the renovation of Lake Victoria and Lake Victoria, when renovated, will be able to take in and let out water something in the order of four to five times its present capacity and this, holding 400,000 acre ft., is the answer to the short term management of the River. And so we say if we have this answer, if we have the ability to say to our growers on the River who remember at the present time are facing with a quota of $1\frac{1}{4}$ million acre ft. a situation of over-committment - now - we are committed to for future known diversions in the River for a figure which will not be covered by $1\frac{1}{4}$ million acre ft. Now am I to say to them I'll take the Lake, still under River Murray Commission management at our door-step, and you will go short of water or am I to say we'll take, as a first stage on the Murray, the Dartmouth scheme, give you management through Lake Victoria, will purchase for another \$2 million as far as South Australia is concerned as our component share of the total cost, for another \$2 million will obtain 35% increase in our divertible water. And there's only one answer that can be given.

(Mr. Dunstan) I can't see this.

(Prof. Castles) Time is running out so we had better get to the bottom of this.

(Mr. Dunstan) Well, there's still one more thing that I want to do because you have still not answered the question which I asked you previously about the Technical Committee's own statements concerning the benefits which Chowilla will give as compared to the Dartmouth scheme with the Lake Victoria renovations.

(Mr. Hall) You are referring to the benefits ^{to} ~~at~~ the other States?

(Mr. Dunstan) The benefits to us in control of salinity.

(Mr. Hall) Oh, look, I think that the Leader of the Opposition has misread this.

(Mr. Dunstan) Oh no, I haven't.

(Mr. Hall) Well look, I wonder could I ask you do you know that this table doesn't start at December it starts on the 1st of May - this salinity table - and, in fact, if you read it carefully you will find that the peak of salinities as compared with

Chowilla and Dartmouth are in favour of Dartmouth at the peak times of demand on the River.....

(Mr. Dunstan) That's certainly not my ----

(Mr. Hall) and it's simply like this that during the winter Chowilla would have provided lower salinity flows in the River, but during the summer Dartmouth provides the lower salinity flows. This is when the demand takes place --- this table starts from the 1st of May.

(Mr. Dunstan) I have had a look at the table but this is what the Committee says and this is the general conclusion. - "A storage at ~~Dartmouth~~ Chowilla will have a smoothing effect on salinity and except for very few occasions would maintain an average salinity below lock 6 of about 20 parts per million below the average that would pertain with a storage at Dartmouth, and it is quite clear on the graph that most of the peaks show advantages in favour of Chowilla.

(Mr. Hall) ~~That~~ The facts are that Chowilla does smooth out the salinity of the River, but Dartmouth gives lower salinity in summer and higher in winter and, in fact, the comparisons that are made are that the average salinity out of Chowilla ~~was~~ is 180 parts per million and the average salinity out of Dartmouth is 200. So there is marginally something in favour of Chowilla as regards salinity. But this is only a small amount.

(Mr. Dunstan) It's not only marginally, just have a look over the whole of this graph.....

(Prof. Castles) I'm afraid the viewers can't see

(Mr. Dunstan) No the viewers can't see. The peaks of salinity that occur over practically the whole area of the graph are greater for Dartmouth than they are for Chowilla.

(Mr. Hall) No, I'm afraid this is quite the opposite if you read it properly because the peaks are with Dartmouth - it peaks high, it peaks low, Chowilla smooths. The report ^{says} ~~states~~ it itself.

(Prof. Castles) Well I'm afraid gentlemen this is going to have to be one of the unresolved issues ---

(Mr. Hall) Well, it's not an important issue anyway.

(Prof. Castles) --- to tonight's debate. I think there were a number of other questions that were raised and thrown at Mr. Hall and back at Mr. Dunstan, but time is running out on us as it always does with this sort of thing. I think it has been a remarkably interesting debate, I think it's been a unique experience to have two people like this debating at this level on television. Now, finally, I would like to call firstly upon Mr.

Dunstan to sum up and say what he will in 1½ minutes to conclude his remarks in tonight's discussion and then I'll be calling on Mr. Steele Hall to have 1½ minutes as well. Mr. Dunstan.

(Mr. Dunstan) The Chowilla proposal was designed to do two major things for South Australia. It was to provide us with extra water to make quite certain that we wouldn't be restricted in probable dry years except perhaps one year in fifty, so that we would be able to get extra water for South Australia. And that we would be able to control the kind of water that was coming into South Australia since we cannot control how much salt is put into the water in certain areas in the other States up river of us. Those two benefits, plus a general regulation of the River, have been studied by hydrologists in South Australia, including Mr. Warren Bonython, to be benefits which cannot be provided by an alternative storage at Dartmouth. The regulation of the River by water right on our door-step is something which is vitally important in our view to South Australia. I do not believe that the Dartmouth proposal can give us the same kind of guarantee and in view of the way in which the other State's haven't gone along ~~with~~ with our guarantees, I am not prepared to rely on what they say now.

(Prof. Castles) Mr. Hall.

(Mr. Hall) Well, let me say that in all times the other States have co-operated properly and correctly in the River Murray Commission. The only contention has been whether or not the Chowilla Dam should be built.

~~It's~~ It's time South Australia stopped talking as if we had the choice of Chowilla or Dartmouth. We no longer have a choice. We have not had a choice since 1967 when it was deferred, and the deferrment was agreed to by the previous Government. Now if we look at it in this light we will try and get the obvious best advantages for this State. We are lucky, extremely lucky, that the Technical Committee which has now reported has found that more water can be provided in greatly increased quantities in the River Murray system, because that gives us a chance to negotiate for it. The quality difference between the two dams is marginal; the cost difference is marginal. What manner of man would I be, what manner of men would my Cabinet be if they said to the people of South Australia we like the look of the dam here but we will deny you an increase in the divertible water of 35%. We can't. We will not.

(Prof. Castles) Gentlemen, thank you very much indeed for taking part in this unique occasion. The Chowilla controversy as I am sure everyone will agree is one which has gripped the minds not only of the people of South Australia, it's gripped the minds of the leaders of the main political parties in this State.

Tonight we have been very greatly priveleged to have our Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in the South Australian Parliament speak so openly and so frankly to the people of this State on an issue which I am sure we all know could well hold the key to the future wealth and the future prosperity of the State of South Australia. Goodnight.

(Announcer) Ladies and gentlemen, we hope you will join us in thanking the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition for making this debate possible. We must also thank Professor Alex Castles in his capacity as Chairman. This was a live non-commercial telecast presented by NWS-9 in the interests of public affairs.